

REMARKS

In the previous Official Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 3, 4, and 9 would be allowable if re-written in independent form to include the limitations of the claims from which they depended. Claim 1 was therefore amended to include the limitations of claim 3, and claim 4 to include the limitations of claim 1. Nevertheless, the Examiner refused to allow the application on the grounds that since claim 9 depended on amended claim 1, rather than being combined with original claim 1, it raised "new issues" because of the possibility of a species combination not previously set forth.

In reply, claim 9 has been combined with original claim 1, so that it now corresponds exactly to the indication of allowable subject matter in the final Official Action. This clearly cannot possibly raise new issues since the previous office action specifically stated that claim 9 "*would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.*"

It is respectfully noted the remaining claims also correspond exactly to the indication of allowable subject matter in the final Office Action. Except for the amendment of claim 9, the amended claims are identical to those presented in the response submitted on November 30, 2005.

Having clearly overcome each of the rejections made in the final Official Action, withdrawal of the rejections and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC


By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
Registration No. 33,805

Serial Number 10/730,075

Date: January 13, 2006

**BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314**

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB.S:\Producer\ben\Pending A...HCC\CHEN 730075\w03.wpd